

1 **Camels Out of Place and Time: The Dromedary (*Camelus dromedarius*) in**
2 **Australia**

3 Sarah L Crowley, Environment and Sustainability Institute, University of Exeter,
4 Penryn Campus, Penryn, Cornwall TR10 9FE, UK. E-mail: s.crowley@exeter.ac.uk

5

6 **Abstract**

7 The deserts of the Australian outback are ideal territories for dromedary camels,
8 *Camelus dromedarius*. Dromedaries' flexible adaptations allow them to eat 80% of
9 Australian plant species and they obtain much of their water through ingesting
10 vegetation; they thrive where other species perish. In many ways, the dromedary
11 could be said to "belong" in this harsh environment. Yet for numerous Australians,
12 particularly ranchers, conservation managers, and increasingly local and national
13 governments, camels are perceived as pests and unwelcome invaders. Anthropologists
14 studying human classifications of nonhuman animals have suggested that those
15 species or populations that fail to fit neatly into existing classification systems come
16 to be considered "out of place," particularly when they enter human domains or
17 disturb existing perceptual boundaries of environmental order. Through exploring and
18 analyzing academic, government, and media publications, this review proposes that
19 today's Australian dromedaries exemplify "animals out of place" and discusses how
20 and why they have developed this status. It is further suggested that in addition to
21 being classified as "out of place" in Australia, the dromedary has also become "out of
22 time," as its classification has transformed with temporal shifts in human
23 circumstances, cultural values, and worldviews.

24

25 **Keywords:** Australia, camels, culture, environment, feral, invasive

26

27 The deserts of the Australian outback are perfectly suited for one-humped dromedary
28 camels, *Camelus dromedarius*. The camel's adaptations to arid environments include
29 a powerful ability to conserve water and a highly flexible diet; camels can eat 80% of
30 Australian vegetation (Saaldfeld and Edwards 2008) and obtain much of their water
31 through the plants they consume, allowing them to thrive where other species perish
32 (Irwin 2009). In many ways, the camel could be said to belong in this environment,
33 perhaps even more so than many native species; few other mammals survive, for
34 example, in the harsh Simpson Desert (Berra 1998). Yet, for many Australians,
35 notably ranchers (Zeng and Edwards 2008a), conservation managers (Zeng and
36 Edwards 2008b), some Aboriginal communities (Vaarzon-Morel 2008), and local and
37 national governments, camels are increasingly perceived as pests, vermin, and
38 unwelcome "invaders" (e.g., *ABC News* 2007; *PM* 2008; Australian Government
39 2010). The current population estimate stands at 1,000,000 individuals, but has varied
40 widely over the past decade (Al-Mansoori 2004; Saaldfeld and Edwards 2008). As
41 their population burgeons, camels encroach more frequently upon human settlements
42 and agricultural lands, raising their media profile and increasing local animosity
43 toward them.

44

45 Following Lévi-Strauss' assertion that animals are "good to think [with]" (1969, p.
46 162), structuralist approaches toward human perceptions of animals often consider
47 how different cultures classify nonhumans (Knight 2000). Mary Douglas, in her
48 influential book *Purity and Danger*, suggested that those substances classified as
49 "dirt" or "pollution" can often be understood as "matter out of place" (1966, p. 35);
50 for example, soil becomes "dirt" when it is brought inside a human home. Douglas

51 explored this concept in terms of food taboos, using the animals forbidden in the
52 Biblical Book of Leviticus as an example. She proposed that ambiguous species
53 (those which fail to fit neatly into classification systems) become pollutants and
54 therefore taboo. John Knight (2000) developed this concept by suggesting that pest
55 species become “animals out of place” when they encroach upon human domains or
56 disturb human perceptual boundaries of “environmental order” (2000, p. 14). Some
57 species achieve this status by physically crossing physical or symbolic human
58 boundaries. For example, rodents entering human homes become inedible pollutants
59 (Fiddes 1991) and hyenas disturbing gravesites are thought to desecrate areas of
60 symbolic importance (Glickman 1995). These concepts all have relevance to camels,
61 whose transgressive status is increasingly problematic in Australia. In this review I
62 suggest that today’s Australian dromedaries exemplify “animals out of place” and
63 attempt to identify how and why they have developed this status. I also propose that
64 the camel is not only increasingly considered “out of place” in Australia, but also “out
65 of time,” as its classification and treatment have transformed in concordance with
66 temporal shifts in human circumstances, cultural values, and worldviews.

68 **The Camel in Australia**

69 When the camel was first brought to Australia in the 1800s, the country was in the
70 midst of a flurry of colonial activity, including numerous attempts to explore the “Red
71 Centre” (McKnight 1969; Al-Mansoori 2004; Irwin 2009). Camels were recognized
72 by pioneers as the most appropriate mode of transport for the challenging
73 environment they were attempting to traverse; they require significantly less water,
74 feed on a wider variety of vegetation, and are capable of carrying heavier loads than
75 horses and donkeys (Vaarzon-Morel and Edwards 2010). Dromedaries (primarily

76 managed by west Asian immigrants who were familiar with their husbandry) were
77 therefore highly influential in the establishment of Australia's modern infrastructure,
78 notably the laying of the Darwin–Adelaide Overland Telegraph Line and the
79 construction of the Transnational Railway (Irwin 2009). Once this infrastructure was
80 in place, however, and motorized transport became increasingly widespread, camels
81 were no longer indispensable. In the early part of the 20th century they rapidly lost
82 their economic value and their displaced handlers either shot their wards or released
83 them into the outback (Al-Mansoori 2004, Jones and Kenny 2010). In 1925, South
84 Australia introduced the “Camels Destruction Act,” permitting landowners to shoot
85 loose dromedaries on private land.

86

87 In the following years, Australia's remaining camels effectively faded into the desert,
88 and away from human society, for the first time in hundreds of years. In 1969
89 McKnight noted that, “The Australian camel is a vague element in Australian
90 consciousness ... only a small proportion realizes that feral camels exist today in large
91 numbers” (1969, p. 122). Their re-emergence into the Australian cognizance
92 coincided only with times of drought, when thirsty dromedaries congregated at water
93 sources, often the same places humans had chosen to settle (McKnight 1976). It was
94 not until the 1980s that surveys of Australia's interior hinted at the true extent of the
95 camel's population growth and only in 2001 that reports of damage caused by camels
96 were brought to the general populace (Vaarzon-Morel and Edwards 2010). In 2006,
97 severe drought caused hundreds of camels to arrive at the town of Dockers River, an
98 event that received considerable media attention and arguably inspired current
99 attempts to manage the population. Over the past decade, media coverage regarding
100 free-roaming camels has increased and has remained predominantly negative.

The Australian deserts are climactically comparable with the camel's presumed "EEA" (Environment of Evolutionary Adaptation, most likely the desert areas of the Middle East: Bulliet 1985, 2005; Clutton-Brock 1987). As the Australian desert parallels the arid environments dromedaries evolved to exploit, it is unsurprising that they have flourished there. To the outsider, therefore, it might seem that rather than being "out of place," the camel is very much *in* place in Australia; indeed, the outback supports the only known wild population of dromedary camels in the world (Simberloff and Rejmánek 2011). Yet over the past decade, the camel has become a source of contention and debate in Australian discourse (e.g., Malkin 2009; Everingham 2009; Gabbatt 2009; Henderson 2009), primarily following well-publicized concerns about the economic and environmental damage caused to property and land by large numbers of "uncontrolled" camels (Edwards et al. 2008). Whilst most agree that the Australian camel now requires management, there remains debate as to how this should be implemented long-term, particularly between those who would cull the camels and those who wish to see them farmed for meat or mustered and exported to interested nations, particularly in the Middle East (see Theodoulou 2010; Wills 2011). As of September 2012, the Australian Feral Camel Management Project (AFCMP) had reduced numbers by 100,000 since its implementation and continues to cull at a rate of 75,000 camels per year (*The Telegraph* 2012; AFCMP 2012).

Camels Out of Place

Physical Transgressions

Dromedaries are on average six feet tall at the shoulder (Irwin 2009), diminishing somewhat the effectiveness of cattle fencing as an obstacle to their movement. By some accounts, camels may not even see small fences and consequently walk straight through them (McKnight 1976; *PM* 2008). Alternatively, camels may intentionally push through fencing to reach a water source, which they can sense from up to three kilometers away (Al-Mansoori 2004). Groups of camels arriving on agricultural properties and settlements in Australia, normally in times of severe drought, can cause significant damage in their search for water (Edwards, Zeng and Saalfeld 2008). By “trespassing” in this way, camels are crossing physical boundaries erected by humans (though these have often been primarily designed to keep livestock in rather than camels, specifically, out). For people in the affected areas—and those who read the subsequent reports—camels consequently undergo a perceptual shift, from unobtrusive desert nomads to deviants, invading human space and competing with humans and their livestock for water and vegetation. Although camels rarely physically threaten humans, their large bulk and group sizes intimidate human populations, who may have received little information as to how to cope with their arrival (Vaarzon-Morel 2008).

Whilst these transgressions strongly affect the humans who experience them, they are perhaps less influential upon the general Australian psyche than the camels’ wider “boundary-crossing”: into Australia itself. Given the substantial impact on the Australian environment of introduced plants, rabbits, foxes, cats, and cane toads (see McKnight 1976; McLeod 2004; Van Driesche and Van Driesche 2004), many Australians (and indeed, concerned parties outside Australia) have developed broadly negative perceptions of non-native species (Johnstone and Marks 1997; Franklin

2007). Such species, particularly in conservationist discourse, cross two important perceptual boundaries. First, they are “alien,” in that humans associate them with a different country or environment from that which they now occupy, and second, they are often simultaneously “unnatural,” in that humans have introduced them (Milton 2000). For conservationists who, Milton suggests, aim to maintain nature in some (usually historical), ideal form, camels are quite literally in the wrong place. Thereby even where there is little objection to the actions of individual camels, or even where camels are absent, as a species they become classified as unnatural inhabitants of the Australian ecosystem.

An interesting parallel can be drawn here between Australia’s camels and their original cameleers, generally referred to as “Afghans,” though most actually emigrated from British India. The “Afghan” label, it has been suggested, “Served the purpose of classifying them as Alien or Asiatics under various restrictive laws curtailing their rights to own property, land, or engage in independent business” (Ganter 2008, p. 490). The camel’s initial popularity in transport and haulage allowed cameleers to become successful and relatively well-established. However, they faced continuous opposition from competing bullock teamsters, and in the 1890s a rise in White Australian nationalism and “Anti-Afghan groups” culminated in the introduction of fees for camel grazing and cameleer use of public highways. In 1897, the Imported Labour Registry Act prevented “colored aliens” from importing more immigrant workers to expand their businesses (Ganter 2008; Jones and Kenny 2010).

As a result of their evolutionary origin and centrality to Islamic and Middle Eastern culture, dromedaries are often considered symbolic of Islam or of Arabia and North

Africa (Simoons, 1994; Irwin 2009). It should be emphasized, however, that I do not believe camels serve as a metaphor for non-white immigrants or Australian Muslims in this context. Although negative attitudes to camels and negative attitudes to non-white immigrants both appear to stem from conflicted constructions of nativity and otherness, there is little to suggest that human racial or cultural prejudice has any significant causative or obligatory relationship with concerns about non-native species. For example, there is no indication that eco-warriors vehemently opposing “invasive” non-native species are more likely hold the same beliefs, even subliminally, about human immigrants (Simberloff 2003; Smout 2009). Rather, there are parallels apparent in the dialogues surrounding these conflicts and, importantly, much of the same language is drawn upon in both debates. As Smout (2009) notes, the terms “native” and “alien” are hardly value neutral, even though they are often intended as such in scientific literature; the latter is inherently linked with outsiders and “otherness”.

Although their status as non-native has become increasingly relevant as part of the modern debate, I propose that the Australian camels’ most significant physical transgression is, somewhat ironically, their success in the outback and, as a result, their sheer numbers. Reports estimate there are upwards of a million free-ranging camels in Australia and predict that this number could double every eight years (Saalfeld and Edwards 2008). Many of the prominent environmental concerns about the population, such as soil degradation, are related specifically to large numbers of camels. Individually, the soft, evenly weight-distributing pads of dromedary feet have little impact on the ground (Berra 1998), and as camels are generalists and continuously moving browsers, they are unlikely to deplete localized or particular

types of vegetation in the long term unless they are in large numbers, or enclosed (Dörge and Heucke 2003). Greater population sizes also increase pressure on water sources, particularly in times of drought (Saalfeld and Edwards 2008).

Symbolic Transgressions

As Putman comments, “Some animal pests ... are only pests when in inappropriate numbers or in the wrong context” (1989, p. 2 cited by Knight 2000). Given that the Australian dromedary wasn’t generally considered a pest species until recent years (McKnight 1969 cf. Edwards et al. 2008; it goes unmentioned by Fitzgerald, Fitzgerald and Davidson 2007), it appears that this increase in numbers has been the primary cause of its reclassification as a pest. Arguably, then, the camel’s status as an introduced species—hitherto ignored, or even celebrated (McKnight 1969; Berra 1998)—has been transformed by its transgressions. By multiplying, expanding their range, and coming into direct conflict with humans and livestock, Australian dromedaries have now been classified as “invasive.” Definitions of this term vary (cf. DEFRA 2011; US Department of Agriculture 2012; Australian Government 2013), but the primary qualifying characteristics are non-nativity and acting (or having the potential to act) as a threat to native biodiversity, “natural” ecosystems. It is worth noting here that the term “invasive” is somewhat contentious, as it inherently implies a disruptive, somewhat militaristic intentionality that is highly unlikely to describe the manner in which camels and other “invasive” species truly act (Larson, 2008; Davis, 2009; Selge, Fischer and van der Val 2011). The implicit negativity of this language, however, serves to highlight the significance and stigma attached to stepping “out of place”; by becoming members of the “invasive” group, camels are unavoidably associated with environmental degradation and biological threat. Thus, the extent and

form of the camels' physical boundary-crossing, intentional or otherwise, has drastically affected their perceptual categorization and symbolic associations (for a similar discussion in relation to changing perceptions of Australia's feral donkeys, see Bough [2006]).

In comparison, for many nomadic pastoralist cultures (such as the Bedouin in the Middle East and the Tuareg and Somalis in North Africa) the concept of too many camels is inconceivable. It is currently understood that dromedaries were domesticated in the hot deserts of the Middle East between two and four thousand years ago (Irwin 2009). Dromedaries have repeatedly been singled out from other domestic species by desert pastoralists due to their adaptive "design," resilience, and consequential value to those humans living in harsh climactic conditions. In the Qur'an, for example, camels are referred to as "ta Allah," God's gift (Al-Mansoori 2004). In such traditions, camels have become symbolic of life, power, and success; indeed, in some cultures they were historically the currency against which all wealth was measured (Toth 1997; Al-Mansoori 2004).

In Australia, however, camels have a less distinguished history. Dromedaries were an uncommon addition to the "ecological imperialism" described by Crosby (1986), by which European expansionists brought their familiar fauna and flora with them as they emigrated to new lands. The preferred domestic species within this "colonial biota" were those to which settlers were acclimatized and experienced at husbanding and utilizing. These species also adapted relatively successfully to new habitats comparatively free from predation and disease (Crosby 1986). As noted above, camels were initially imported specifically for the purposes of traversing and

250 preparing Australia's inhospitable environment for the settlement of the "colonial
251 biota." However, dromedaries were as alien to most European immigrants as the
252 native fauna and, though initially widely utilized, they were later largely overlooked
253 by settling pastoralists in favor of sheep, cattle, and horses. As a result, camels
254 secured no firm place in the developing Australian economy and culture.

255

256 At the time of their introduction, camels also held little cultural relevance to resident
257 Aboriginal populations (Franklin 2006). Unlike native species, dromedaries have no
258 "Dreaming," or totemic links with the people and "country" (Vaarzon-Morel 2008).
259 Whilst the presence of camels is generally ignored, tolerated, or in some cases utilized
260 (e.g., through tourism) they may eat plants or foul water holes that are considered
261 sacred, thus damaging and polluting "country" (Vaarzon-Morel 2008). However,
262 some informants perceive camels as symbolic of the development of Aboriginal
263 settlements and therefore an adopted part of "country" and their area's history
264 (Tangentyere Landcare 2005; Vaarzon-Morel 2008). Bough suggests that:

265

266 Aboriginal people are far more accepting of an animal species that has proved
267 its worth and lived for generations on the land. It is a European derived notion
268 that there is somehow an environmental and biological "purity" to which we
269 can return through the eradication of feral animals ... (2006, p. 394)

270

271 Though introduced as domesticates, the majority of Australian dromedaries are now
272 free ranging. They are consequently categorized by the wider Australian populace as a
273 feral species. "Feral" is defined as, "In a wild state, especially after escape from
274 captivity or domestication" (*OED* 2011). Ingold suggests that the definition of a wild

275 animal is essentially one that is “out of control” and that feral animals are
276 consequently “likened to convicts on the run” (1994, p. 3). Feral species, therefore,
277 are “out of place” by definition; they are escapees from the confines of human
278 control. Compare the Australian dromedary with the two-humped Wild Camels
279 (*Camelus ferus*) in the Gobi Desert, which have recently been granted additional
280 conservationist protection because they have been acknowledged as a distinctly
281 separate species from the domesticated Bactrian camel, *Camelus bactrianus* (Burger
282 2011; Hare 2011) and are no longer simply feral cousins. By this simple distinction
283 the Wild Camels have earned their classificatory freedom (and, in turn, their real-
284 world freedom from persecution).

285

286 Interestingly, Australia’s dromedaries might actually fall somewhere *between* the
287 categories of domesticated, wild, and feral. It is possible that camels are one example
288 of a species that was, or is, “tame in the wild” (Bulliet 2005, p. 99). Bulliet (2005)
289 suggests that Camelids, which have no apparent defensive weapons nor a strong flight
290 response, evolved to avoid predation through adapting to and exploiting ecological
291 niches such as inhospitable deserts or plains. He points to the remarkable lack of
292 response to human presence and disturbance shown by wild guanacos (a small South
293 American Camelid from which llamas descend), coupled with the stark absence of
294 wild dromedaries in modern North Africa and the Middle East, to support his theory
295 that Camelid species could have been “domesticated” through a relatively passive
296 process by which humans, “Assume control over a more or less tame in the wild
297 species, rather than from a period of long-term captivity and reproductive isolation
298 from wild stock, as presumed in standard theories of domestication” (Bulliet 2005, p.
299 99). While the “wild” dromedary may simply have become extinct, given the

300 accumulative nature of nomadic pastoralism in the Middle East, it is also plausible
301 that “wild” dromedaries were assimilated into existing herds. Indeed, they would have
302 been a favored pastoral species *because* of their pre-existing adaptations to the desert
303 environment and may thus have been little altered by human selection. At present,
304 however, Australian dromedaries have been assigned to the feral category and are
305 consequently primarily perceived as a species that can and should be under human
306 control. This serves the purpose of stripping camels of any protection or advocacy as
307 a “wild” species (unlike the dingo, for example, the wild/feral status of which remains
308 under debate [Smith 1999]).

309
310 The salient point here is that the classificatory systems of much of Australia’s
311 contemporary human population have not evolved to incorporate camels in any
312 significant sense. Therefore, as well as being perceived as physically “alien,” camels
313 are also culturally and symbolically “out of place.” The European-descended
314 population does not recognize them as traditional, useful domesticates and for many
315 Aboriginal peoples they lack historical and religious significance. Without this
316 cultural identity, camels come to represent just another invasive, feral species, out of
317 the captivity in which they are presumed to belong and thus primarily symbolic of
318 unnatural, uncontrolled deviancy.

321 **Camels Out of Time**

322 In his book *Hunters, Herders and Hamburgers*, Richard Bulliet (2005) introduced the
323 concept of the “post-domestic” society, which he characterizes in two ways. Firstly,
324 post-domestic citizens are physically and psychologically distanced from most of the

325 animals they depend on and are not involved with the processes by which these
326 animals are made consumable. Secondly, this distancing causes feelings of guilt and
327 disgust when post-domestic peoples are required to confront and consider the
328 aforementioned processes, which is done “as seldom as possible” (Bulliet 2005, p. 3).

329

330 In contrast, Bulliet describes traditional nomadic pastoralist societies (such as the
331 Bedouin) and notes that, “Within pastoral groups, many day-to-day transactions are
332 based on the societal convention that animals have value as living beings regardless of
333 the products their bodies might yield” (2005, p. 176). Although generalizations,
334 Bulliet’s analyses reasonably describe “typical” post-domestic and traditional
335 pastoralist cultures and are therefore useful for the purposes of this discussion.

336

337 The transformation to domestic societies, Bulliet argues, began in North America with
338 the market economy, in which, “Small numbers of people pastured enormous
339 numbers of livestock on vast tracts of land” (2005, p. 179) for the purpose of sale.
340 Consequently, the landowners—“ranchers”—were increasingly required to perceive
341 animals in terms of money or goods received in exchange, rather than as valuable in
342 themselves. Post-domestic societies are described as the (seemingly inevitable)
343 conclusion of this trajectory, in which animals are perceived, processed, and sold as
344 commodities. It is Bulliet’s “ranching” rather than “pastoralist” model that became
345 established in Australia: large numbers of European livestock, particularly sheep and
346 cattle, were introduced and grazed across vast ranges. From this foundation, Australia
347 has developed into the textbook “post-domestic” society described by Bulliet (2005),
348 with the majority of the population living in urban areas and far removed from the
349 herding, mustering, and slaughter of the animals they consume.

350

351 The Australian camel, once again, does not fit into this picture. Removed from the
352 intrinsic value granted by traditional desert pastoralism (itself a diminishing way of
353 life), once Australia's dromedaries had fulfilled their original economic purpose they
354 retained little value in post-domestic Australia.

355

356 In 2008, the reports of economic and environmental damage and concern caused by
357 camels culminated in a government-commissioned project and publication by
358 Edwards et al., which was intended to assess the impact of feral camels and human
359 attitudes toward them. The researchers aimed to record the perspectives of "key
360 stakeholders" in feral camel management: ranchers, "conservation managers," and
361 "Aboriginal peoples." Notably, the camels themselves were not recognized as valid
362 stakeholders in their own existence, nor were they represented by humans acting on
363 their behalf (e.g., as the interests of native species are represented by conservation
364 managers). The interests of the camels were arguably precluded from consideration
365 because they had been pre-classified as invasive aliens, or feral escapees, with no
366 legitimate claim on the territories they inhabit. Thus, human perceptions of camels
367 were to some extent apparent before the study investigating them had even begun.

368

369 Although there were variations in methodology, one trend was clear: a strongly
370 utilitarian attitude prevailed. Camels were perceived as pests primarily because of the
371 economic damage they caused to the "infrastructure" of properties (Edwards et al.
372 2008). The only positives investigated by the surveyors were also utilitarian—whether
373 key stakeholders had sold, eaten, or made "any other income" from camels (Zeng and
374 Edwards 2008a, b).

375

376 Another significant concern, also enforced by media reports, was that feral camels
377 “compete with livestock” (e.g., Theodoulous 2010) for food and water, although this
378 has not yet been confirmed by researchers (Zeng and Edwards 2008a). Again, this
379 highlights a post-domestic perspective. Much of the camels’ territory overlaps with
380 that of cattle (ABS 2006 cf. Saalfeld and Edwards 2008). Both are introduced species,
381 yet cattle retain their economic value to humans as part of Australia’s vast red meat
382 industry, whereas camels do not. In competition, therefore, cattle are protected as
383 valued domesticates, while camels, outside the sphere of human protection, are
384 considered pests.

385

386 Economic considerations also thread through much of the debate surrounding how the
387 growing camel population should be managed. In 2009, a large-scale culling
388 operation began. There were objections to this from animal welfare groups and some
389 landowners (Firth 2009; Gabbatt 2009; *The Telegraph* 2012) who were concerned that
390 the method of culling (from helicopters, leaving the bodies to waste) is inhumane.
391 Most objectors, however, were primarily concerned that culling is economically
392 wasteful; they felt that the camels should be mustered for slaughter or export (see
393 *ABC News* 2008; Firth 2009; Phillips 2009; *The Telegraph* 2012).

394

395 Aboriginal informants were also keen for camels to be “utilized” rather than culled,
396 but their position was less economically focused and more comparable with the
397 worldview that, “Animals are offended by *unnecessary* killing: that is, by killing as an
398 end in itself rather than to satisfy genuine consumption needs” (Ingold 1994, p. 9).

399 Crucially, the Aboriginal informants' perspectives differed from that of the
400 researchers and the ranchers in that it engaged with the camels themselves:

401

402 In considering what is at stake, they have weighed up their concern for feral
403 camels as sentient beings against their concern for country ... they are willing
404 to consider culling if it is the only option. In their view, culling has a vital
405 purpose—the maintenance and renewal of country. On the one hand, this
406 position represents a significant shift in perspective from one where culling is
407 perceived as “killing for nothing.” On the other hand it is consistent with the
408 Aboriginal ethic which stresses the need to care for country and related beings.
409 (Vaarzon-Morel 2008, p. 118)

410

411 Here, this “concern for country” is informed partially through the Aboriginal peoples’
412 observations of camels damaging local vegetation and watering holes, but also
413 through the predominant perception of camels as a wider environmental threat.

414

415 This perception, reinforced by the Australian and international media (e.g., *PM* 2008;
416 Hubble 2009; Marshall 2011), appears largely grounded on Edwards et al.’s (2008)
417 report which implied that in large numbers, camels significantly damage vegetation
418 and degrade the ground, thus impacting the balance of local ecosystems. There are
419 also concerns regarding the global environment, as camels are ruminants and thus
420 produce methane, contributing to Australia’s carbon emissions (Morello 2010).

421 Although the accuracy of these assertions is not questioned here, it is important to
422 note that the environmental impacts of even 1,000,000 feral camels pales in
423 comparison to that of the 28,500,000 cattle currently residing in the country (*ABS*

424 2011a, b). Yet following reports of dust storms gathering over Sydney, the camels
425 were blamed for increased desertification of “country” (Hubble 2009; Vaarzon-Morel
426 and Edwards 2010).

427

428 Lexicographer Jay Arthur believes that, “There are vocabularies associated with
429 particular animals which are concerned not merely with violent opposition, but which
430 testify to a sense of corruption, of the place being polluted with the[ir] presence”
431 (2003, p. 176). Camels are now referred to as “humped pests,” “a plague,” “real
432 danger” (*The Telegraph* 2009), and “menacing” (*AM* 2009), and their actions
433 described as “ravaging” (*PM* 2008) and “marauding” (*The World Today* 2009). Here,
434 the camels are suddenly attributed agency; their crossing of acceptable human
435 boundaries is somehow deemed purposeful and rebellious. These accusations lie in
436 stark contrast to the praise laid upon those dromedaries who assisted colonists in the
437 exploration and establishment of modern Australia, and highlight how temporal
438 changes in culture—specifically, shifting economic and environmental values—have
439 affected human interpretations of the presence, purpose, and even behavior of
440 Australian camels.

441

442 Milton (1996) and Smith (2006) frame environmentalism as not just a socio-political
443 movement, but also an “intrinsically cultural phenomenon” (Smith 2006, p. 370).
444 Smith (2006) further proposes that Australian environmentalism can be considered as
445 a form of mythology, a collection and amalgamation of stories relating to people and
446 place. With this in mind, it is worth highlighting that the growing negativity in public
447 attitudes toward dromedaries has coincided with the appearance of what Smith (1999)
448 and Franklin (2006) refer to as “eco-nationalism,” a somewhat complex form of

449 patriotism based on the linking of national identity and native species. Smith (1999)
450 comments that contemporary concepts of non-native feral species simultaneously
451 recognize and deny the human population's own status as (largely) "non-native" and
452 suggests that this conflict, "Manifests itself as an anxious state of belonging" (Smith
453 1999, cited by Franklin 2006, p. 19). In trying to address Australia's apparent
454 ecological concerns, it is perhaps less troublesome for the human population to
455 concentrate on the impacts of nonhuman groups, such as dromedaries, which can be
456 more definitively and less contentiously classified as outsiders and invaders.
457
458 I present these biases to underline the impact that the camel's lack of contemporary
459 socio-cultural significance, and classification as alien, feral, and invasive has on its
460 standing in public perceptions. Although cynical, it is also reasonable to suggest that
461 these labels allow disproportionate blame to be placed upon camels, thus making
462 them a problem that can be "managed." This is perhaps easier than acknowledging the
463 true impact and challenges of a post-domestic system of large-scale animal production
464 and consumption in a country that is poorly suited to the pressures placed upon it.
465
466 However, the extensive and continual changes to Australia's environment did not
467 begin with colonial Europeans. The last significant extinction event, during the
468 Pleistocene epoch, coincided with the arrival of humans on the continent. Whilst there
469 is much debate as to whether climate change, human land management (such as large-
470 scale burning), or direct hunting was the major cause, numerous species of "mega-
471 fauna" went extinct during this period (Crosby 1986; Bulliet 2005). Australian
472 ecologist Chris Johnson (quoted by Jones 2010) has alluded to the possibility of an
473 Australian "re-wilding" initiative, similar to those proposed by Donlan and colleagues

in the United States (Donlan 2005; Donlan et al. 2006). These initiatives plan to repopulate the Americas with species pushed to extinction in the Pleistocene, either by reintroducing species such as horses, or importing appropriate replacements for extinct types (such as Bactrian camels to replace extinct relative *Camelops*). It has been suggested that in Australia, dromedaries may have re-occupied a niche left empty by the extinction of large herbivores and actually helped to restore the balance of Australia's damaged ecosystems (Jones 2010). This viewpoint is notable because it clearly contrasts with current perceptions. For "re-wilders," then, the camel may become a replacement for an extinct species and therefore regain its value, as a viable and important part of the ecosystem.

Conclusion

What has been almost entirely absent from all of this discourse is any direct study or consideration of the camels themselves, who are arguably also "key stakeholders" in this debate. Although culls and management of camels reduces numbers, the outback is clearly an ideal place for camels to thrive; the AFCMP has acknowledged that management measures will need to be continuous (AFCMP 2012). Somewhat ironically, despite the autonomy and agency of camels being largely ignored or misrepresented in discussions about their position in Australia, it is this same autonomy—their ability to thrive, without humans, in one of the world's harshest environments—that has caused the debate. The Australian dromedary through human eyes is an animal both out of place and time: it is physically and symbolically problematic for the majority of the population, has served its economic purpose in Australia, and is not represented or celebrated by a cultural heritage of camel pastoralism.

499

500 For dromedaries, however, Australia has been a place of temporary respite, where
501 their actions have been neither controlled nor directed by humans and where retreat
502 into the harsh desert climate has, until recently, served to protect individuals from
503 those who would hunt them. Despite the extensive culls, there is no doubt that camels
504 can and will continue in the Australian desert—where humans cannot be—in a place
505 they have made their own.

506

507 **Acknowledgements**

508 I am grateful to Samantha Hurn, for all her advice and support, and to the Anthrozoös
509 reviewers for their valuable feedback. An earlier version of this paper was presented
510 at the 2012 ISAZ Conference in Cambridge, UK.

511

512 **References**

513 ABC News. 2007. Camels blighting rural Australia: Expert.

514 [http://www.abc.net.au/cgi-](http://www.abc.net.au/cgi-bin/common/printfriendly.pl?/news/australia/wa/kalgoor/200703/s1873132.htm)

515 [bin/common/printfriendly.pl?/news/australia/wa/kalgoor/200703/s1873132.htm](http://www.abc.net.au/cgi-bin/common/printfriendly.pl?/news/australia/wa/kalgoor/200703/s1873132.htm).

516 Accessed on December 9, 2012.

517

518 ABC News. 2008. Throw another camel on the barbie: Experts urge cull of feral
519 pests. <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2008/12/10/2442312.htm>. Accessed on
520 December 9, 2012.

521

522 Al-Mansoori, A. K. A. 2004. *The Distinctive Arab Heritage*. Abu Dhabi: Dar Al
523 Baroudi.

524

525 AM. 2009. Camel culling faces biblical hurdle. ABC Radio National: 23 May 2009.

526 <http://www.abc.net.au/am/content/2009/s2578939.htm>. Accessed on December 9,

527 2012.

528

529 Arthur, J. M. 2003. *The Default Country: A Lexical Cartography of Twentieth*

530 *Century Australia*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

531

532 Australian Bureau of Statistic (ABS). 2006. Chapter 14—Livestock. Year Book

533 Australia, 2006.

534 <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/0/8345877D2FBA8C4DCA2570DE001671>

535 95?opendocument. Accessed on December 9, 2012.

536

537 Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). 2011a. Livestock. Agricultural Commodities,

538 Australia, 2009–10. <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Products/7121.0~2009->

539 10~Main+Features~Livestock?OpenDocument. Accessed on December 9, 2012.

540

541 Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). 2011b. Broadacre crop production up,

542 livestock numbers down. *Agricultural Commodities, Australia, 2009-10*.

543 <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mediareleasesbytitle/D793AD9EE6BCF107>

544 CA257456001F1839?OpenDocument. Accessed on December 9, 2012.

545

546 Australian Feral Camel Management Project (AFCMP). 2012. Australia's feral camel

547 population declining.

548 [http://www.feralcamels.com.au/sites/default/files/upload/mr_100_000_feral_camels_r](http://www.feralcamels.com.au/sites/default/files/upload/mr_100_000_feral_camels_removal_14sep12.pdf)
549 [emoved_14sep12.pdf](http://www.feralcamels.com.au/sites/default/files/upload/mr_100_000_feral_camels_removal_14sep12.pdf). Accessed on December 9, 2012.

550

551 Australian Government. 2010. National feral camel action plan.
552 <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/invasive/ferals/camels/index.html>.
553 Accessed on December 9, 2012.

554

555 Australian Government. 2013. Invasive species.
556 <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/invasive/>. Accessed on May 25, 2013.

557

558 Berra, T. M . 1998. *A Natural History of Australia*. San Diego: Academic Press.

559

560 Bough, J. 2006. From value to vermin: A history of the donkey in Australia.
561 *Australian Zoologist* 33(3): 388–397.

562

563 Bulliet, R. 1985. *The Camel and the Wheel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
564 Press.

565

566 Bulliet, R. 2005. *Hunters, Herders and Hamburgers: The Past and Future of Human–*
567 *Animal Relationships*. Chichester: Columbia University Press.

568

569 Burger, P. 2011. Domestication of Old World camels. Paper presented at “The Camel
570 Conference 2011,” London, UK, May 23–24, 2011.

571

572 Clutton-Brock, J. 1987. *A Natural History of Domesticated Mammals*. Cambridge:
573 Cambridge University Press.
574

575 Crosby, A. W. 1986. *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe,*
576 *900–1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
577

578 Davis, M. A. 2009. *Invasion Biology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
579

580 DEFRA (Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs). 2011. GB Non-
581 native Species Secretariat: Definition of Terms.
582 <https://secure.fera.defra.gov.uk/nonnativespecies/index.cfm?pageid=64>. Accessed on
583 May 25, 2013.
584

585 Donlan, J. 2005. Re-wilding North America. *Nature* 436(7053): 913–914.
586

587 Donlan, J., Berger, J., Bock, C. E., Bock, J. H., Burney, D. A., Estes, J. A., Foreman,
588 D., Martin, P. S., Roemer, G. W., Smith, F. A., Soulé, M. E. and Greene, H. W.
589 2006. Pleistocene rewilding: An optimistic agenda for twenty-first century
590 conservation. *The American Naturalist* 168: 660–681.
591

592 Dörge, B. and Heucke. J. 2003. Demonstration of ecologically sustainable
593 management of camels on Aboriginal and pastoral land. Final report on NHT project
594 no. 200046. Canberra: Natural Heritage Trust.
595

596 Douglas, M. 1966. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and*
597 *Taboo*. London: Routledge and Keagan Paul.

598

599 Edwards, G. P., McGregor, M. J., Zeng, B., Vaarzon-Morel, P. and Saalfeld, W. K.
600 eds. 2008. *Managing the Impacts of Feral Camels in Australia: A New Way of Doing*
601 *Business*. Alice Springs: Desert Knowledge CRC.

602

603 Edwards, G. P., Zeng, B. and Saalfeld, W. K. 2008. Evaluation of the impacts of feral
604 camels. In *Managing the Impacts of Feral Camels in Australia: A New Way of Doing*
605 *Business*, 133–182, ed. G. P. Edwards, M. J. McGregor, B. Zeng, P. Vaarzon-Morel
606 and W. K. Saalfeld. Alice Springs: Desert Knowledge CRC.

607

608 Everingham, S. 2009. Camel slaughter: A tough decision for locals. *ABC News*.
609 <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2009/12/08/2764631.htm?section=justin>.
610 Accessed on 9 December 2012.

611

612 Fiddes, N. 1991. *Meat: A Natural Symbol*. London: Routledge.

613

614 Firth, N. 2009. Multi-million pound cull of world's only wild herd of camels begins in
615 Australia's Outback. *The Daily Mail*.
616 [http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/worldnews/article-1209608/Cull-worlds-wild-herd-](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/worldnews/article-1209608/Cull-worlds-wild-herd-camels-begins-Australias-Outback.html)
617 [camels-begins-Australias-Outback.html](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/worldnews/article-1209608/Cull-worlds-wild-herd-camels-begins-Australias-Outback.html). Accessed on December 9, 2012.

618

619 Fitzgerald, G., Fitzgerald, N. and Davidson, C. 2007. Public attitudes towards
620 invasive animals and their impacts. Report to the Invasive Animals Cooperative
621 Research Centre. Canberra, Australia.
622

623 Franklin, A. 2006. *Animal Nation: The True Story of Animals in Australia*. Sydney:
624 University of New South Wales Press.
625

626 Franklin, A. 2007. Human–nonhuman animal relationships in Australia: An overview
627 of results from the first national survey and follow-up case studies 2000–2004.
628 *Society & Animals* 15: 7–27.
629

630 Gabbatt, A. 2009. Australian camel cull plan angers animal welfare groups. *The*
631 *Guardian*. [http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/nov/26/australia-thirsty-camels-](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/nov/26/australia-thirsty-camels-animal-welfare)
632 [animal-welfare](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/nov/26/australia-thirsty-camels-animal-welfare). Accessed on December 9, 2012.
633

634 Ganter, R. 2008. Muslim Australians: The deep histories of contact. *Journal of*
635 *Australian Studies* 32 (4): 481–492.
636

637 Glickman, S. 1995. The spotted hyena from Aristotle to the Lion King: Reputation is
638 everything. *Social Research* 62(3): 501–537.
639

640 Hare, J. 2011. The wild camel. Paper presented at “The Camel Conference 2011,”
641 London, UK, May 23–24, 2011.
642

643 Henderson, A. 2009. "Slow, bitter death" fears as camel cull looms. *ABC News*
 644 <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2009/12/01/2758256.htm>. Accessed on December
 645 9, 2012.
 646
 647 Hubble, A. 2009. The camels that broke the desert's back. *The Telegraph*.
 648 [http://www.telegraph.co.uk/expat/expatlife/6867374/The-camels-that-broke-the-](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/expat/expatlife/6867374/The-camels-that-broke-the-deserts-back.html)
 649 [deserts-back.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/expat/expatlife/6867374/The-camels-that-broke-the-deserts-back.html). Accessed on December 9, 2012.
 650
 651 Ingold, T. 1994. From trust to domination: An alternative history of human–animal
 652 relations. In *Animals and Human Society: Changing Perspectives*, 1–22, ed. A.
 653 Manning and J. A. Serpell. London: Routledge.
 654
 655 Irwin, R. 2009. *Camel*. London: Reaktion.
 656
 657 Johnstone, M. J. and Marks, C. A. 1997. Attitudinal survey on vertebrate pest
 658 management in Victoria. Report Series 3. Frankston, Victoria: Department of Natural
 659 Resources and Environment.
 660
 661 Jones, C. 2010. Camels to rescue in ecosystem. *The Australian*.
 662 [http://www.theaustralian.com.au/higher-education/camels-to-rescue-in-](http://www.theaustralian.com.au/higher-education/camels-to-rescue-in-ecosystem/story-e6frgcjx-1225828459967)
 663 [ecosystem/story-e6frgcjx-1225828459967](http://www.theaustralian.com.au/higher-education/camels-to-rescue-in-ecosystem/story-e6frgcjx-1225828459967). Accessed on December 9, 2012.
 664
 665 Jones, P. G. and Kenny, A. 2010. *Australia's Muslim Cameleers: Pioneers of the*
 666 *Inland, 1860s–1930s*. Kent Town, South Australia: Wakefield Press.
 667

668 Knight, J. 2000. *Natural Enemies: People–Wildlife Conflicts in Anthropological*
669 *Perspective*. London: Routledge.

670

671 Larson, B. M. 2008. Entangled biological, cultural and linguistic origins of the war on
672 invasive species. In *Body, Language, and Mind*, 169–196, ed. T. Ziemke, J. Zlatev,
673 and R. M. Frank. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

674

675 Lévi-Strauss, C. 1969 [1963]. *Totemism*. Trans. R. Needham. Harmondsworth:
676 Penguin.

677

678 Malkin, B. 2009. Australian PM Kevin Rudd labelled a “serial killer” over camel cull.
679 *The Telegraph*.
680 [http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/australiaandthepacific/australia/5979261](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/australiaandthepacific/australia/5979261/Australian-PM-Kevin-Rudd-labelled-a-serial-killer-over-camel-cull.html)
681 [/Australian-PM-Kevin-Rudd-labelled-a-serial-killer-over-camel-cull.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/australiaandthepacific/australia/5979261/Australian-PM-Kevin-Rudd-labelled-a-serial-killer-over-camel-cull.html). Accessed
682 on December 9, 2012.

683

684 Marshall, J. 2011. Feral camels plague Australian Outback. *Discovery News*.
685 <http://news.discovery.com/animals/wild-camels-australia-outback-110517.html>.
686 Accessed on December 9, 2012.

687

688 McKnight, T. L. 1969. *The Camel in Australia*. Melbourne: Melbourne University
689 Press.

690

691 McKnight, T. L. 1976. *Friendly Vermin: A Survey of Feral Livestock in Australia*.
692 London: University of California Press.

693

694 McLeod, R. 2004. *Counting the Cost: Impact of Invasive Species in Australia, 2004.*

695 Canberra: Cooperative Research Centre for Pest Animal Control.

696

697 Milton, K. 1996. *Environmentalism and Cultural Theory: Exploring the Role of*

698 *Anthropology in Environmental Discourse.* London: Routledge.

699

700 Milton, K. 2000. Ducks out of water: Nature conservation as boundary maintenance.

701 In *Natural Enemies: People–Wildlife Conflicts in Anthropological Perspective*, 229–

702 248, ed. J. Knight. London: Routledge.

703

704 Morello, N. 2010. Can the Outback cut Australia's greenhouse gas emissions?

705 *Scientific American.* [http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=can-the-](http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=can-the-outback-cut-australias-greenhouse-gas-emissions)

706 outback-cut-australias-greenhouse-gas-emissions. Accessed on December 9, 2012.

707

708 OED (Oxford English Dictionary). Online Edition. 2011.

709 <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com>. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

710

711 Phillips, A. 2009. Camel cull a waste. *ABC Rural News.*

712 <http://www.abc.net.au/rural/wa/content/2009/07/s2635811.htm>. Accessed on

713 December 9, 2012.

714

715 PM. 2008. Calls for a new camel cull in Australia. ABC Radio National: Tuesday

716 December 9, 2008. <http://www.abc.net.au/pm/content/2008/s2441931.htm>. Accessed

717 on December 9, 2012.

718

719 Saaldfeld, W. K. and Edwards, G. 2008. Ecology of feral camels in Australia. In
720 *Managing the Impacts of Feral Camels in Australia: A New Way of Doing Business*,
721 9–34, ed. G. P. Edwards, M. J. McGregor, B. Zeng, P. Vaarzon-Morel and W. K.
722 Saaldfeld. Alice Springs: Desert Knowledge CRC.

723

724 Selge, S., Fischer, A. and van der Wal, R. 2011. Public and professional views on
725 invasive non-native species: A qualitative social scientific investigation. *Biological*
726 *Conservation* 144(12): 3089–3097.

727

728 Simberloff, D. 2003. Confronting introduced species: A form of xenophobia?
729 *Biological Invasions* 5(3): 179–192.

730

731 Simberloff, D. and Rejmánek, M. eds. 2011. *Encyclopedia of Biological Invasions*.
732 London: University of California Press.

733

734 Simoons, F. J. 1994. *Eat Not This Flesh: Food Avoidances from Prehistory to the*
735 *Present*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

736

737 Smith, N. 1999. The howl and the pussy: Feral cats and wild dogs in the Australian
738 imagination. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 10(3): 288–305.

739

740 Smith, N. 2006. Thank your mother for the rabbits: Bilbies, bunnies and redemptive
741 ecology. *Australian Zoologist* 33(3): 369–378.

742

743 Smout, C. 2009. How the concept of alien species emerged and developed in 20th-
 744 century Britain. *International Urban Ecology Review* 4: 119–127.

745

746 Tangentyere Landcare. 2005. *The Camel Book*. Alice Springs: Tangentyere Landcare.

747

748 Theodoulou, M. 2010. Camel-loving Saudis respond to cull of the wild. *The Times*.
 749 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/asia/article6995900.ece>. Accessed on
 750 December 9, 2012.

751

752 The Telegraph (online). 2009. Australia to cull 6,000 camels in Outback.
 753 [http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/australiaandthepacific/australia/6661431](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/australiaandthepacific/australia/6661431/Australia-to-cull-6000-camels-in-Outback.html)
 754 [/Australia-to-cull-6000-camels-in-Outback.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/australiaandthepacific/australia/6661431/Australia-to-cull-6000-camels-in-Outback.html). Accessed on December 9, 2012.

755

756 The Telegraph. 2012. Tens of thousands of feral camels culled in Australian outback.
 757 [http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/wildlife/9542535/Tens-of-thousands-of-feral-](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/wildlife/9542535/Tens-of-thousands-of-feral-camels-culled-in-Australian-outback.html)
 758 [camels-culled-in-Australian-outback.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/wildlife/9542535/Tens-of-thousands-of-feral-camels-culled-in-Australian-outback.html). Accessed on December 9, 2012.

759

760 The World Today. 2009. Feral invasion prompt camel cull. *ABC Radio National*:
 761 November 26, 2009. <http://www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/content/2009/s2754252.htm>.
 762 Accessed on December 9, 2012.

763

764 Toth, A. 1997. The camel trade of northern Arabia and the Bedouin economy, 1850–
 765 1950. Paper presented at the “31st Annual Meeting of the Middle Eastern
 766 Association,” San Francisco, USA, November 22–24, 1997.

767

768 US Department of Agriculture. 2012. What is an invasive species?
 769 <http://www.invasivespeciesinfo.gov/whatis.shtml>. Accessed on May 25, 2013.
 770
 771 Vaarzon-Morel, P. 2008. Key stakeholder perceptions of feral camels: Aboriginal
 772 community survey (abridged). In *Managing the Impacts of Feral Camels in Australia: A New Way of Doing Business*, 79–124, ed. G. P. Edwards, M. J. McGregor, B. Zeng,
 773 P. Vaarzon-Morel and W. K. Saalfeld. Alice Springs: Desert Knowledge CRC.
 774
 775
 776 Vaarzon-Morel, P. and Edwards, G. 2010. From beast of burden to symbol of the
 777 desert/feral animal: The metamorphoses of the camel in central Australia. *Dialogue: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences (Australia)* 29(1): 5–17.
 778
 779
 780 Van Driesche, J. and Van Driesche, R. 2004. *Nature Out of Place: Biological*
 781 *Invasions in the Global Age*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
 782
 783 Wills, D. 2011. New abattoir in Port Pirie to sell 100,000 camels to Middle East. *The*
 784 *Advertiser*. [http://www.news.com.au/national/new-abattoir-in-port-pirie-to-sell-](http://www.news.com.au/national/new-abattoir-in-port-pirie-to-sell-100000-camels-to-middle-east/story-e6frfkx9-1226036989759)
 785 [100000-camels-to-middle-east/story-e6frfkx9-1226036989759](http://www.news.com.au/national/new-abattoir-in-port-pirie-to-sell-100000-camels-to-middle-east/story-e6frfkx9-1226036989759). Accessed on
 786 December 9, 2012.
 787
 788 Zeng, B. and Edwards, G. P. 2008a. Key stakeholder perceptions of feral camels:
 789 Pastoralist survey. In *Managing the Impacts of Feral Camels in Australia: A New*
 790 *Way of Doing Business*, 25–62, ed. G. P. Edwards, M. J. McGregor, B. Zeng, P.
 791 Vaarzon-Morel and W. K. Saalfeld. Alice Springs: Desert Knowledge CRC.
 792

793 Zeng, B. and Edwards, G. P. 2008b. Key stakeholder perceptions of feral camels:
794 Conservation manager survey. In *Managing the Impacts of Feral Camels in*
795 *Australia: A New Way of Doing Business*, 63–78, ed. G. P. Edwards, M. J. McGregor,
796 B. Zeng, P. Vaarzon-Morel and W. K. Saalfeld. Alice Springs: Desert Knowledge
797 CRC.